FY04 LTC Board Analysis
Functional Area 50

Disclaimer: This information is a summary of the results of the FY04LTC promotion board. Any trends indicated are simply observations based on the results of the board for ISCF officers. It is important to note that the data does not reflect institutionalized requirements for promotion but a reflection of dynamics of the FY04 LTC board results.

FA50 FY 04 LTC Board Statistics

- Primary Zone (YG88)
  - 14 Considered
    - All officers had completed MEL4*!*
  - 11 Selected (78.6%)
- Above the Zone (YG87 and prior)
  - 15 Considered
  - 7 “Seriously” Considered (i.e., completed MEL4); and
  - 2 Selected (13.3% of total; 1 did not complete CSC).
- Below the Zone (YG88)
  - 11 Considered
  - 10 “Seriously” Considered (i.e., completed MEL4); and
  - 0 Selected.

FA50 FY 03 LTC Board Statistics

- Both of the AZ officers were previously one time non-select. Of the 16 AZ officers that went before the board, only 43% completed MEL 4.

Analysis

- OPMS3 (the system previously know as OPMSXXI) seems to be working well. Promotion rates are supposed to be comparable between career fields (i.e., Operations, IO, OS, and IS)...
  - The reason the Army does not commit to comparability between actual functional areas and branches (e.g., between 50s and IN or AR) is that with such small numbers the former could be easily skewed with one additional or one less selection.
- Promotion "comparison" rates are based on DOPMA averages. This is calculated by dividing the total number of officers selected for promotion in all zones (PZ, AZ, and BZ) by the number of officers in the PZ (YG88).

LTC 04	AZ %	PZ %	BZ%	DOPMA %
ARMY	9.1%	76.9%	6.8%	90.7%
OPS	6.9%	79.0%	7.4%	91.2%
OS	13.6%	72.2%	5.7%	88.9%
IO	14.0%	70.6%	5.5%	89.2%
IS	13.7%	73.3%	5.6%	90.8%
FA50	**13.3%**	78.6%	0.0%	92.9%

Comparison of Total Considered

LTC 04	AZ		%	PZ		%	BZ		%	DOPMA		%
ARMY	1113	101	9.1%	1396	1073	76.9%	1356	92	6.8%	1396	1266	90.7%
OPS	756	52	6.9%	965	762	79.0%	894	66	7.4%	965	880	91.2%
OS	147	20	13.6%	198	143	72.2%	227	13	5.7%	198	176	88.9%
IO	93	13	14.0%	102	72	70.6%	110	6	5.5%	102	91	89.2%
IS	117	16	13.7%	131	96	73.3%	125	7	5.6%	131	119	90.8%
FA50	**15**	**2**	**13.3%**	**14**	**11**	78.6%	**11**	**0**	0.0%	**14**	**13***	92.9%

* NOTE: "Minimum Selection Requirement" = 13

Analysis*

- **When reviewed, dissected, etc., the analysis of this board reveals the following—Selection seems to come down to two factors:**
  - **<u>CGSC Completion</u>.**
    - **All but one of the officers selected in the PZ and AZ had completed CGSC (7/16 AZ and 10/11 BZ). This is a must. Those who are not MEL4 except one were not selected. Res or Non-Res attendance were not factors.**
  - **<u>Strength of File</u>.**
    - **As previously suggested in board "analyses," the single most significant factor consistently appears to be "strength of file." The "proxy" which seems to be the most instructive is the Ratio of Above Center of Mass (ACOM) OERs = # ACOMs/ # Total OERs);**

*Caveat: This is one Assignment Officer's "take" on

Analysis (Continued)

- Other factors. While last year's analysis included numbers regarding advanced degrees, ARSTAF/Joint time, resident and non-resident MEL4, BQ time, etc. these factors (just as was the case last year) do not seem to be a good predictor (either way) regarding selection.

- Important Caveat: Clearly the board does NOT do a simple *mathematical equation* re: top-block OERs. I know this. More things are considered (e.g., performance in BQ jobs, MEL4, joint/ ARSTAF time, more recent reports, ranks of SRs, pictures/read: fat, advanced degree, etc. etc.)...
  - Again, however, this "strength of file" analysis has been a great proxy with which one can rank an officer's relation to others. The last three board analyses suggest this factor explains 90%+ of selections/non-selections.

FA50 FY04 LTC Board Analysis

- While clearly the “whole” file was assessed, there seems to be a very, very strong correlation between an officer’s manner of performance (i.e., OERs) and promotion to LTC. All other factors (e.g., Res/NR CGSC; advanced degrees, BQ time, Joint/ARSTAF time, etc,) did not seem to matter as much as how officers performed.

- **On a different note—Of those selected, It is important to note that ACOM profiles have improved when compared to 2003 ACOM profile. Still, it can be asserted that had it not been for a minimum selection, some officers would not have been promoted depending on the cut line—which can have an impact later in your career should you aspire SSC and the rank of COL.**

- **In summary, for the 11 officers in FY89 who will be going before the LTC board in the primary zone next year (2005), note that the range of -9 ACOMs for this selection board ranged from 28% to 100% with 100% CGSC completion. Should you aspire to be or remain competitive, your objective is clear.**
- **AZ officers should continue on a path of CGSC completion and profile improvement. As demonstrated by those officers who were selected above the zone this year, If you show improvement and are able to sustain such improvement in your current job, then selection is plausible.**